## Pages 1 - 33

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable William H. Orrick, Judge

DEMETRIC DI-AZ, OWEN DIAZ, and )
LAMAR PATTERSON, )

Plaintiffs,

VS. ) NO. C 17-06748 WHO

TESLA, INC. dba TESLA MOTORS, )
INC.; CITISTAFF SOLUTIONS, )
INC.; WEST VALLEY STAFFING )
GROUP; CHARTWELL STAFFNG )
SERVICES, INC.; and DOES 1-50, )
inclusive,,

Defendants.

San Francisco, California Friday, March 24, 2023

## TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

**APPEARANCES:** (via videoconference)

For Plaintiffs:

CALIFORNIA CIVIL RIGHTS LAW GROUP

332 San Anselmo Avenue

San Anselmo, California 94960

BY: LAWRENCE A. ORGAN, ATTORNEY AT LAW

ALEXANDER MORRISON + FEHR LLP 1900 Avenue of the Stars - Suite 900

Los Angeles, California 90067

BY: J. BERNARD ALEXANDER, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE)

REPORTED BY: Marla F. Knox, CSR No. 14421, RPR, CRR, RMR

United States District Court - Official Reporter

1	APPEARANCES: (CO	ntinu	ed)
2	For Plaintiffs:		ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
3			177 Post Street - Suite 300
4		BY:	San Francisco, California 94108 MICHAEL RUBIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW
5			COLLIER LAW FIRM, LLP 240 Tamal Vista Boulevard - Suite 100
6		BY:	Corte Madera, California 94925  DUSTIN COLLIER, ATTORNEY AT LAW
7	For Defendants:	<b>D</b> 1.	DODIIN CODDIEN, ATTORNET AT LAW
8 9	ror berendanes.		QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 51 Madison Avenue - 22nd Floor New York, New York 10010
10		BY:	ALEX SPIRO, ATTORNEY AT LAW
11			QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 865 South Figueroa Street - 10th Floor
12		BY:	Los Angeles, California 90017  DANIEL C. POSNER, ATTORNEY AT LAW  MARI F. HENDERSON, ATTORNEY AT LAW
13			QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP
14			300 West 6th Street - Suite 2010 Austin, Texas 78701
15		BY:	ASHER GRIFFIN, ATTORNEY AT LAW
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

## Friday - March 24, 2023 1 .m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: We are under way in case number 17-6748, 4 5 Diaz versus Tesla. Counsel, if you would please, state your appearance for 6 the record. 7 MR. POSNER: Dan Posner for the Defendant Tesla. 8 MR. ALEXANDER: Bernard Alexander on behalf of the 9 Plaintiff, Mr. Diaz. 10 MR. COLLIER: Dustin Collier also on behalf of the 11 Plaintiff. 12 13 MR. ORGAN: Larry Organ on behalf of the Plaintiff Owen Diaz. 14 15 MR. RUBIN: And Michael Rubin on behalf of the 16 Plaintiff. 17 MR. SPIRO: Good afternoon, Your Honor, this is Alex Spiro and I will enter appearances for myself and my 18 19 colleagues, Asher Griffin, Dan Posner and Mari Henderson from 20 Quinn Emanuel. 21 THE COURT: Great. Good afternoon to all of you. And so the purpose of this hearing is to figure out who 22 23 among the prospective jurors we should excuse on the basis of the questionnaires. Did you have a chance to speak with each 24 25 other about this topic?

```
MR. ORGAN:
                          Yes, we did, Your Honor.
 1
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. And do you have agreements with
     respect to excusing anybody?
 3
                          Yes, we do, Your Honor.
 4
              MR. ORGAN:
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
 6
              MR. ORGAN: We have agreements relative to health
     issues, which I think the Court had already decided, as to 45
 7
     and 59, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT:
 9
                         Yep.
              MR. ORGAN:
                          Okay. And then I believe -- Dustin, was
10
11
     it 48 that we agreed had an issue on health?
              MR. COLLIER: I believe, that's correct.
12
13
              MR. ORGAN: Forty-eight, Your Honor.
                         (Pause in proceedings.)
14
15
                         And then, perhaps, Your Honor, I can jump
              MR. SPIRO:
16
     in because I hear the silence. We had also discussed amongst
17
     the parties a couple of other jurors. I'm not so sure the
18
     parties have had sufficient time to, per se, stipulate.
19
     Perhaps the Court could give us some quidance on the Court's
20
     views and maybe on some other subjects so that we can
21
     streamline this.
22
              THE COURT:
                          Sure.
23
              MR. SPIRO:
                         I believe the jurors --
              THE COURT: Why don't you let me tell you what I
24
25
     think.
```

MR. SPIRO: Sure.

THE COURT: I will give you some ones that I think you should think about and then you can let me know.

So, juror number 35 was excused already because she served on a jury within the last year so we got that survey.

Juror number 5 served within -- virtually last served on March 16th of 2022. So I'm going to be inclined to let that person go.

And then of the others that I would like you to think about, juror number 2 had financial issues, had heard of the case, expressed strong sentiments regarding Tesla.

Juror number 25 expressed financial hardship.

Juror number 26 is in Redding taking care of a sick mother.

Juror number 33 has childcare issues.

Juror number 45 serious anxiety-related issues and also had some strong feelings about one of the parties.

Juror number 51 is starting a new job and is concerned about traveling to San Francisco.

I'm not saying that you need to agree to dismiss any of those -- excuse any of those folks, but it is -- and I'm not going to excuse them if you don't agree, but those were ones that I thought you might have been thinking about and discussing. So, Mr. Spiro, go ahead.

MR. SPIRO: Sure. I had the same concern about folks

that had heard about the case. So I can tell the Court
immediately we would excuse juror number 2. I think that is an
easy one and would be rife with problems if we didn't.

And then there were two others that I noted that I can tell you immediately that comments that they made caused me concern based on health and mental health issues that they suggested, which were 45 and 56.

So those I can tell the Court that we would have no issue with, and I would need another moment to just take a look at the other ones that the Court identified, if I would consent but those I will consent to.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MR. SPIRO: Obviously the Court indicated juror number 5, so I did not address juror number 5, however.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MR. ORGAN: Just so I have it right, you are number 2, number 45 and 56; is that correct?

MR. SPIRO: That is correct -- that is correct. And if the Court wanted to give us a moment to meet and confer amongst ourselves; but, perhaps, that's not what the Court wants. So I have given my sure consent on the record to the ones that I indicated.

(Pause in proceedings.)

MR. ALEXANDER: Your Honor, I believe we would be in agreement with regard to number 2.

```
With regard to number 56, I believe we would be in
 1
 2
     agreement to that as well.
              MR. COLLIER: 45 as well, Bernard, was on our list.
 3
              MR. ALEXANDER:
                              That's true. Forty-five we already
 4
 5
     agreed to dismiss.
              MR. SPIRO: Well, if I could ask the Plaintiffs if
 6
     there's others that I could maybe quickly hone in on those if
 7
     you-all have a more precise list than mine.
 8
              MR. COLLIER: I just meant it was on our list of ones
 9
     that we would agree to dismiss if the Court had a concern about
10
11
     them and it does.
                         (Pause in proceedings.)
12
13
              MR. ORGAN:
                          I would say, Your Honor, I think we are in
     agreement on certainly 59. The Court has already struck; 48 I
14
15
     think the parties did agree on so...
16
              THE COURT:
                          I agree with you. And so I'm going to
17
     excuse them, and I'm going to excuse the three that everybody
     has just consented to; and I'm wondering whether there are any
18
19
     others that you have consented to.
20
                         We had discussed number 19, Your Honor, in
              MR. ORGAN:
     our meet-and-confer a little earlier. The person there is --
21
22
              THE COURT: Well, so all I care about is whether you
23
     agree or not.
                         Okay. Yeah, we haven't heard back from
24
              MR. ORGAN:
     them whether they agree to 19 or not, so...
25
```

THE COURT: Mr. Spiro, is there anybody else that you would like to suggest now that you haven't suggested before to the Plaintiffs and there is no agreement on?

MR. SPIRO: At this point -- I mean, one that I had that the Court noted that, I guess, perhaps my lack of knowledge of geography has slowed my thinking on was the juror that said "resided four hours from San Francisco."

And, frankly, I didn't know what to make of that. That didn't sound to me -- it sounded to me like a far way.

THE COURT: Well, that is too far. Which juror was that?

MR. SPIRO: I think it was one of the ones the Court indicated, which was juror 26.

THE COURT: Yeah, so, with respect to juror 26 -- I can't remember whether it's a man or a woman, but I think it is a woman -- and she is taking care of her ill mother in Redding. Is there really an interest to see whether she will come down, which I don't know whether she would show up anyway given that situation?

MR. SPIRO: My comment to the Court was my lack of geography is that I don't know, frankly, how far that is. I see her indication that it's very, very far and the Court's indication; but the reason why I had not even looked at that juror was because I didn't make heads or tails of that location yet. I need to go on Google maps or something.

```
Speaking for Plaintiff, Your Honor, I
 1
              MR. COLLIER:
     think we appreciate the concern. We share it. I think we are
 2
     somewhat interested in hearing from this person as far as how
 3
 4
     much of a hardship one week would be, whether there is
 5
     alternative caregiving that can be provided.
          I'm not sure if -- I didn't see any indication in the
     questionnaire that they were told about the length of the
 7
             So I'm not sure if that would make things easier for
 8
     this person or what sort of alternatives they might have.
 9
10
                          Okay. We will keep her in. That's fine.
              THE COURT:
11
          Anybody else?
              MR. ALEXANDER: I don't know if we mentioned that we
12
     would be willing to stipulate to 25.
13
              MR. COLLIER: Yes.
14
15
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
16
              MR. SPIRO: Yeah, I think we are in --
17
                         (Pause in proceedings.)
18
              MR. SPIRO:
                          That's not somebody that we can just
19
     immediately excuse from the Defense's side.
20
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
              MR. COLLIER: Did you say that it is or is not?
21
22
     sorry.
23
              MR. SPIRO:
                          Is not.
              MR. COLLIER: Okay. We do concur with the Court's
24
     assessment of the financial hardship, but I suppose we will
25
```

explore that more on Monday.

We have some additional ones that we think it would be appropriate to excuse that have not come up yet, but I assumed Your Honor wanted to focus on the agreements first.

THE COURT: I did. And I'm not going to -- if you have had a full discussion with the Defense and they have, for whatever reason, disagreed with you, I'm not going to make any other adjustments; and we will deal with the issues as they come up on Monday.

MR. COLLIER: I think that makes sense, Your Honor. The only other one that I think we might be in agreement on given the comments today is 31. Mr. Spiro had indicated there were two jurors that said they were familiar with the prior trial. This is the other one. We already agreed to dismiss 2. Plaintiff would be agreeable to dismissing 31 as well for that same reason.

MR. SPIRO: That's fine with us, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We will dismiss 31 as well. Okay.

Have we exhausted this area?

MR. SPIRO: I believe so, Your Honor.

MR. COLLIER: I believe that's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So, from the lists we will make sure that the jury has excused 45, 5, 10, 35, 59, 2, 56, and 31.

MR. COLLIER: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I don't

```
believe --
 1
              MR. ALEXANDER: I don't think there is agreement on
 2
    number 5.
 3
              MR. COLLIER: Yeah.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Okay. I will leave 5 in for a second but
     I think -- I can tell you that if he or she served -- last
 6
     served on March 16th of 2022, and is being called back now, I
 7
     will probably give that person a pass but that's fine.
                                                             I will
 8
     leave 5 in.
 9
              MR. ALEXANDER: Your Honor, there is one -- with
10
11
     regard to 19 and 21, they are both instances where people
     represent Tesla. Nineteen is -- it's a law firm that
12
     represents Tesla, Morrison and Foerster; and 21, the spouse is
13
     a lawyer for the State involved in a lawsuit with Tesla.
14
                                                               Ιt
15
     would seem that those two would be automatically excluded.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Spiro, what is your view on
17
     that?
              MR. SPIRO: That may very well be the case,
18
19
     Your Honor. We haven't had a chance to fully explore that; but
20
     if the Court is inclined to think that that business
21
     relationship is -- is -- or adverse relationship certainly is
     fatal, then we could save some time there.
22
23
              THE COURT: So, Mr. Alexander, that would be your
     desire to have them excused?
24
25
              MR. POSNER: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
So why don't we do that. We will excuse
 1
              THE COURT:
     19 and 21 as well.
 2
              MR. ALEXANDER: Excellent.
 3
              MR. COLLIER: Your Honor, I'm sorry to do this but can
 4
 5
     we get what list you have one last time just to make sure we
 6
     are on the same page.
              THE COURT: I will try to throw out different numbers,
 7
    Mr. Collier.
 8
                                (Laughter)
 9
              THE COURT: So we just did 19 and 21, 31, 56, 45, 59,
10
11
     48.
         Did we have agreement on 10? I don't think so.
              MR. COLLIER: I don't show anything on 10, Your Honor.
12
13
     I do show that we were agreed on 2.
              THE COURT: And 2, yes.
14
              MR. COLLIER: And, yeah, I think that was it.
15
16
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. I saw the three
17
     objections that came in yesterday.
18
              MR. COLLIER: Oh, I'm sorry, Your Honor. We just
19
     realized 10 was the one with vacation conflict. Plaintiff
20
     would be okay with that going as well. Apologies.
21
              THE COURT:
                          That's all right. Mr. Spiro, did you
22
     agree on 10?
              MR. SPIRO: I think we should speak to this person
23
    based on those sort of calls on the others. If it's a
24
25
    non-refundable plane ticket, that's typically the barrier to
```

entry here, so -- but if that's how it works out when the person comes in, then I will understand the Court's ruling at that time.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. As to the objections that were filed, one of them, the -- I -- I see the exceptions to the preliminary jury instructions, but I think we have argued that. I have heard argument sufficient on that, and I'm overruling those.

The opening slides, it seemed fine to me. I -- there was one, I think, maybe misconception on Tesla's part.

I will give the preliminary instructions before opening statements. So it's not that they are, you know, sort of up in the air.

And then it's a -- you will argue differently than they will about the instructions in all manner of things; but given where this trial is, I don't see anything that is, you know, (inaudible) about the slides that are there.

MR. SPIRO: Yes, Your Honor, if I may address that briefly. I would agree with the Court, perhaps, in summation but obviously opening statements are not argument. It is just to lay out the facts that you intend to show.

The Court has the providence of the law. They are not the speakers of the law, and there is no real way. The law and the facts is per se argument; right.

So you are just giving them the law. Plaintiff is giving

them the facts that they intend to prove.

There is no possible basis to put back up the law unless you are going to argue that which is, per se, improper in opening statement.

So, to the Court's point about argument, sure in summation, right, that would be fine but not in opening, which is why it's not done and why at least in my experience courts do not allow that even in a case such as this.

THE COURT: Have you had experience in a case such as this when a case has come back just for damages and preliminary instructions have laid out what are predicate facts for the jury?

So, the -- so I think emphasizing what's -- what the case is about is okay, and I think laying out -- reminding people what -- what the Plaintiffs' side thinks will be important as the evidence proceeds is okay.

So, I don't agree with you; that that's -- it is certainly true that you don't expect to have argument in opening statement, but I think this case is just in a slightly different posture than -- than any trial that I have done.

MR. SPIRO: I can't say that I have one on all fours, but I have tried cases that have been tried before and then put back for retrials and --

THE COURT: Where liabilities had been established and the preliminary jury instructions state what these state?

MR. SPIRO: Not precisely. But, again, in my view, what the Court just said in substance; that they can -- they can marshal the jury to what the actual issues are, I agree with; right. They can do exactly that. We are not going to open and suggest otherwise.

But that's a different question than whether or not they can put snippets of jury instructions up, which is the hallmark of argument; right.

So they are going to stand up and say: "All you have to decide in this case is X or Y," absolutely they can say that; and that solves the question that the Court is sort of rhetorically posing.

And that's a different -- a different animal than actually having the jury instructions when there again, it's not the -- they are not the providence of the law. The instructions are snippets and we think misleading.

And I think if the Court were to pull them and look at them, you would see that. And so that, in and of itself, is argument; and then they are going to argue how the facts apply to the law, which is also argument.

So we don't see how that's necessary, and we think it is prejudicial and improper; and it is not -- again, in my experience, in -- done in opening statements for those reasons even in retrials.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I -- thank you for your

It is overruled. 1 argument. And then the final issue is the Amy Oppenheimer slides, 2 and I have not had a chance to go back to her trial testimony; 3 and I couldn't find her expert report. 4 5 So I would like the Plaintiffs to lodge that with me this afternoon, and I will take a look at that and then we can 6 discuss that further. 7 MR. COLLIER: Would Your Honor like us to lodge the 8 report and the prior testimony or just the report? 9 10 I have a very large binder of all of the THE COURT: 11 testimony --(Laughter) 12 13 MR. COLLIER: Fair enough. THE COURT: -- from the first trial, and I'm looking 14 15 forward to reviewing it from time to time, so; but I would like 16 to have the report, please. 17 MR. COLLIER: Understood, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Okay. And I don't know, Mr. Spiro, if you 19 want to say anything now or if you want to save it until I have 20 had a chance to go through things. 21 I know that the Plaintiffs just filed a response, which I 22 have not looked at in any way. To be efficient with the Court's time, I 23 MR. SPIRO:

will reserve on that issue until the Court has had a chance to

24

25

digest everything.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. THE COURT: So those were the things on my Mr. Organ or Mr. Alexander or Mr. Collier or Mr. Rubin, mind. is there anything else on the Plaintiffs' side that you wanted to go through today? MR. ALEXANDER: There's one other issue, Your Honor. At the previous trial, if you will recall, we lost a juror because it turned out they had stock in Tesla and they were able to figure that out late in the game. And so I just wanted to remind the Court of that, so when the Court does question, you can make sure even inside the retirement accounts because that's how that juror found it. I remember and I will be explicit. THE COURT: I thought I had covered that in the questionnaire, but it may not have been explicit enough. So I will definitely ask the question. MR. ORGAN: And, Your Honor, just one other thing. filed an administrative motion much like Tesla filed relative to having our support staff bringing things to the court for Monday's trial. Just bringing that to your attention, Your Honor, so that perhaps you could sign it. They can come in and bring their stuff in too. Well, the boss of this is in the upper THE COURT:

MR. ORGAN: And I will say, Your Honor, we did ask

left-hand corner of my screen, and --

```
Ms. Davis already and she did say that that was okay.
 1
     just -- because Tesla went through the process of doing an
 2
     administrative motion, I thought to be safe we should probably
 3
     file one too, so...
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
                                 It is granted.
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
              MR. ORGAN:
                          Mr. Spiro, anything else we should talk
 7
              THE COURT:
     about today?
 8
                          Sure, if the Court will indulge, there is
 9
              MR. SPIRO:
     some concern on my part and I raised it in a recent other case
10
11
     in the district, which is some of these grievances with
     Mr. Musk and Tesla being aired publicly.
12
          So I would ask to do some combination of what we did in
13
     the recent trial to protect against that because I don't want
14
15
     to be in a position that jeopardizes the panel as a whole.
16
              THE COURT:
                          No.
                               I agree. And is there -- was there a
     procedure that Judge Chen used that you were happy with?
17
          We can do one of two things -- we can do one of three
18
     things. We can -- there are a number of people I'm going to
19
20
     speak with individually.
          I can have them hang back at a break after asking the
21
     public questions of everybody as opposed to doing a sidebar and
22
23
     calling people up and back, which I think gets a little --
     people get a little antsy doing that.
24
          So I think -- now that I'm talking about it, I think
25
```

```
that's what I will do. I think I will ask the -- do the voir
 1
     dire of the -- of individual jurors who do not raise sensitive
 2
     issues in the -- I will do that open, and then I will just take
 3
     a break for those people and have them come back in an hour and
 4
 5
     have the other people wait outside and take them -- call them
     in one at a time.
 6
                              So we will do the Tesla issues at the
 7
              MR. ALEXANDER:
     end after we have determined whether there are any other
 8
     issues?
 9
              THE COURT: So -- so what I'm thinking of, let's say
10
11
     there is somebody who is an enormous -- I don't know whether I
    need to do admirer but I probably should -- but somebody who
12
    has expressed a strong view one way or another about Mr. Musk
13
     or Tesla, I would not ask them questions in front of all of the
14
15
     other jurors.
16
          So, those people I would just wait to ask questions of
17
     until the other ones are done. Then I would let the other ones
     go on recess for an hour or so, and then I would try and take
18
     the other people individually.
19
20
              MR. COLLIER: And this is before any strikes, any
     challenges?
21
22
                          Exactly right.
              THE COURT:
23
              MR. COLLIER: Understood.
              MR. SPIRO: That makes sense and what was obviously
24
```

preferable to the Court. Another way to do it is to get

25

them -- well, I guess it doesn't matter which way that we get them out of the way if they are extreme in their views.

I don't mind them being voir dired, frankly, about everything else in open. I just don't want to be in a situation where they pollute the panel. That's my concern because then I'm stuck between a rock and a hard place.

MR. COLLIER: We should probably do the same with anybody who has expressed sort of -- or formed views on damages and that sort of thing as well. Same sort of concern about polluting the panel. I think those folks should be reserved as well if that's all right with the Court.

THE COURT: All right. You are asking me to reserve just about the entire panel one way or another.

So I will go through -- I will tell you what I'm going to do. First of all, I appreciate the concern and the process that we will use will address that concern.

I will go through -- now that I know who is being excused,
I will go back through the surveys. I will determine what I
think either side would be concerned about being displayed in
open court. And then thinking about how many people that is, I
will come up with a process and I will tell you on Monday at
8:30.

MR. COLLIER: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. SPIRO: In terms of other issues since you have asked the Defense, I mean, there are sort of a few things on my

mind that, perhaps, are obvious but maybe will help streamline this and make it so that there are not repeat issues and things.

And so -- and the Court can, of course, cut me off if these are tedious or not helpful -- but one thing is I assume we are going to refer to the prior testimony as "prior testimony," not "Trial 1" or "Trial 2." These are just things on my mind because that's what you do in lead trials.

And I don't know what the Court's view is on witness disclosure, but given that we all know what the witnesses are and we are trying to get this trial done in a week -- and for logistical purposes, frankly, more than anything -- the Defense is happy to disclose the witnesses in the order that they are calling their witnesses on well in advance, and we would hope that the Plaintiffs would do the same. I don't see the need for -- it is not much of a gotcha trial.

THE COURT: It is not a gotcha trial. I do have sort of a standing order, which is in the pretrial order, about notifying witnesses.

I encourage communication to the extent that you will do, as Mr. Spiro is intending to do, that's great; and -- but otherwise -- at a minimum, you need to follow the standing order.

MR. SPIRO: And then I don't want to go through sort of a litany of lists of things that came up that I think will

create a smoother and fairer trial on round two, but I just want the Court to know that we are going to be objecting to any breaks in people's testimony to call in other witnesses, which is part of the reason why I'm bringing this up at this juncture, because I don't want to leave that as an untold reality; that -- if the Court recalls in the first trial, Mr. Diaz's testimony was stopped so other witnesses could come in and testify mid-testimony about the same things he was testifying about, which was either by genius design or fortuitous for the Plaintiffs.

But we are not going to willingly allow that to happen, and so I don't -- I would rather plan this so we can all be on the same page. And when I do examinations, my time estimates are usually pretty good to make it efficient; but I just want the Court to know we are going to be strongly objecting to that, which happened at the first trial.

THE COURT: Okay. The -- I do -- I assume that all witnesses will be testifying straight on. There was -- and I can't remember what the reasons were, but I am confident that they were good-faith reasons in the first trial and -- and I do expect that everybody is going to be testifying straight through.

MR. ORGAN: Your Honor, the only thing that we would say is we have got two experts who it is difficult to figure out exactly when that they might be on.

So we would ask the Court as to our psychologist expert, Dr. Reading, who testified before, if he could testify first thing Thursday morning followed by our economist, Mr. Mahla.

I did plot out the times, and it should -- that should be in line in terms of the times. Obviously there might be some variations, but -- so -- I'm giving a heads-up now so that Mr. Spiro can see if he has an objection to us doing a specific time for the experts. What's your thought on that, Alex?

MR. SPIRO: I don't -- and this is exactly why I wanted to have this conversation because I know the Court is endeavoring to get this done in a week, and I think we can.

Nobody wants it done in a week more than me, maybe equal but not more.

So I don't have a problem with that; but if they have mapped it out, I would just like to know what the map is.

I don't think -- I guess they will be telling me one day's worth early; right? I don't think that's a big thing for me to ask. It's not going to cause me to, you know, to do some -- yeah, and so with that caveat that we would then have some understanding.

And then the final thing that I would say is if someone is finishing their cross-examination or something to that effect, what I'm not going to allow -- and I hope the Court understands this -- I would be very flexible about most things.

I can't have the Plaintiff then have the psychologist come

in, in the middle of his testimony, and say "This man is very sick." And please continue your testimony. I can't allow that. That wouldn't be me doing my job.

So with those minor caveats, I have no problem with that; and I'm hopeful to work easily to get this done efficiently.

MR. COLLIER: I think the bottom line is at this point the Plaintiff does not intend to call anyone out of order. We intend to finish witnesses when we start them.

Obviously it's a trial and sometimes time estimates are slightly off, and we may need to make adjustments; but we will notify the Court and opposing counsel as soon as any such issue arises. And right now we are not anticipating them.

THE COURT: All right. If there is -- if -- it is a trial, so I'm not going to force you to give your full list in the order that you are intending to call them today to Mr. Spiro, but given the -- your already expressed need to schedule the experts when you are trying to schedule them, then you should be very sure that either you have provided advance -- well in advance notice to the Defense of when you are going to have the order -- how the order is going to work or be sure that things work out time-wise the way that you are hoping they work out.

MR. COLLIER: The way we think it's going to work right now is that we will be able to put those witnesses on first thing Thursday and get them on and off and that will be

```
without breaking any other witness. That's the way it is
 1
     supposed to work right now. And if not, we will ask the
 2
     experts to come a little bit later on Thursday.
 3
              THE COURT: You know what the issue is, so --
 4
 5
              MR. COLLIER: Thank you.
              THE COURT:
                         -- deal with it one way or another.
 7
              MR. ORGAN:
                         Your Honor, just for preparation purposes,
     you previously told us that we should be prepared to put on our
 8
     first witness on Monday in case we get to that after openings?
 9
10
              THE COURT:
                          Uh-huh.
11
              MR. ORGAN:
                          If somehow the Court is extremely
     efficient in terms of voir dire, is there -- should we have
12
     another witness there or --
13
              THE COURT: If it's a five-minute witness, then maybe,
14
15
    but I think the likelihood is that the earliest I would be able
16
     to instruct would be, you know, 2:00 o'clock -- 1:30,
17
     2:00 o'clock, and then I would do the preliminary instructions.
     You would do the openings. And then as long as you had a
18
     witness of a decent length, you would be very safe.
19
20
              MR. ORGAN:
                          Okay.
21
              THE COURT:
                          And I don't know that we will get -- I
     mean, I think -- I don't know whether we will get there or not,
22
23
     frankly, time-wise, so...
                          Great.
24
              MR. ORGAN:
                                  Okay.
25
                         (Pause in proceedings.)
```

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Spiro, more issues?

MR. SPIRO: Well, we don't have to do them all, but there are a few other and maybe this is a good time and I will take the opportunity.

So there were a few other issues that sort of came up at the first trial that I wanted the Court's guidance on attempts at ruling. I don't consider them to be major issues, but I can't leave the record and not make them.

One thing was there were comments from Plaintiffs' Counsel that were along the lines "Well, we've never seen this document before; we've never seen this document before," which the Court chastised Plaintiffs' Counsel for one of these comments; but I just want to make sure that that's not going to happen again because that's improper.

THE COURT: Well, they have now seen the documents, you know, a year and a half before, so I don't think that's an issue, Mr. Spiro.

MR. SPIRO: Okay. Second minor thing is -- and we are almost done for my issues. The second minor thing that I had was they asked the witnesses -- the other witnesses -- Mr. Diaz, of course, is fair game -- they asked the other witnesses, you know, "Did this offend you? Did that offend you? How offensive did you find this? How troubling?"

I didn't understand the evidentiary basis for that. There were objections. The Court -- I don't know if there was clear

guidance from the Court, per se, but that strikes me as improper and also liability has been established.

So I don't know what -- what witness number 11 says, "This I found very, very offensive and it hurts my heart and soul" has to do with a thing; and it is obviously prejudicial and irrelevant.

So we would ask that those questions not be asked again, and I don't want to have to stand up and object to them. They are improper in my view.

MR. ALEXANDER: Your Honor, if I can --

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Alexander.

MR. ALEXANDER: That whole comment is completely out of context. It doesn't discuss what's going on in the workplace, the people conducting investigations. Their opinions as to what they thought at the time is important.

With regard to three of the witnesses, they are African American. With regard to the (inaudible) that was placed in the workplace, it is relevant what they thought.

So for Mr. Spiro to pluck things out of context I don't think is appropriate. I think he needs to make an objection at the time, and there is nothing wrong with the questions at the time it was asked then; and we expect to ask them at the time of trial again.

MR. COLLIER: If I may add just briefly, I believe Your Honor already ruled on this. We discussed this in the

context of the jury instructions and whether harm to others was a proper consideration for the jurors in the context of analyzing reprehensibility. And under *State Farm* it clearly is.

The harm can't be compensated for but it can be assessed in terms of reprehensibility, and the appropriate remedy -- if Mr. Spiro thinks it goes too far -- is a limiting instruction to that effect at the time.

THE COURT: So, the Court -- these issues will come up in the context of the evidence at trial, and I will rule on them as they come.

MR. SPIRO: The final issue that I had, which is more specific, is there were two exhibits that came up at the last trial that are not admissible or not admitted exhibits but came up, but one was an exhibit that was used for solely impeachment, which is Exhibit 106.

Obviously if there is an opportunity to use it for impeachment, it may very well come up; but it is not otherwise admissible or evidence.

And the other exhibit is Exhibit 109, which is an exhibit that is outside of the timeframe that the Court said was not admissible but was used at the prior trial in sort of a pseudo refresh recollection but that the substance of it got in front of the jury. I don't know if the Court recalls it, but the Court has many cases on its docket. Perhaps not. I have just

recently read the transcript.

But the Court already ruled that the exhibit is out. It was used improperly at the last trial and -- in our view and never came into evidence but it was bandied about because it's a depiction of graffiti that is troubling, and they got it in front of the jury last time and got an objection sustained.

I don't want that exhibit just because they were able to do it the last time. And I say that with great -- you know, great credit to good trial lawyers getting things past perhaps; but at the same time, it is not admissible and it is not proper.

So I just want to flag that because, again, it is one of these issues that we know is coming, perhaps. Perhaps they are not going to try it, and I don't want to be standing up objecting because that defeats the purpose of bringing it up now.

THE COURT: So, who is --

MR. ORGAN: Yes, I can deal with this, Your Honor, because I think I had these exhibits before.

With respect to 106, I can't see how it won't be coming in for impeachment. There are three witnesses who testified that they did not receive complaints of the N-word, and that document impeaches all three of them. So, I can't imagine how they are going to avoid that.

Maybe the witness will admit to seeing or making -- you

know, receiving the complaint; but then I can read their prior testimony where they denied it, and then it is proper for the jury to also see that there is an exhibit that impeaches their prior testimony. That goes to their -- it is core credibility issues, Your Honor. So I would say that 106 probably will be coming in again for impeachment and credibility.

And then with respect to 109, I don't think anything was done improperly. I think the Court properly ruled as to the scope of evidence on that issue.

And depending on how their witnesses respond or answer questions, it might become relevant in terms of impeachment again; but I do understand the Court's rulings.

And as the Court has -- might remember, I typically previewed issues with the Court before a witness got on the stand to make sure that we did not run afoul of Your Honor's orders.

And, in fact, Your Honor struck some deposition testimony because -- that the Court had missed the night before because I brought it to the Court's attention because I didn't want to run afoul of your order.

So I think I'm very cognizant of the way the Court has ruled. I appreciate that Mr. Spiro is new to the case and looks at it from a different perspective, and he is an excellent lawyer. So I know that we will be up against a challenging opponent, Your Honor, but I -- I certainly don't

think that we did anything wrong; and I don't see that ruling now makes sense.

I think that the Court will have to rule on an as-is basis. Exhibit 109 was never shown to the jury, and the contents of it were never improperly discussed. So I think it -- I think the Court is very good at ruling as these things come up, so...

THE COURT: Well, so, I do -- I don't -- you will be shocked to know that I don't have -- I don't remember exhibits by number particularly in trials that happened a year and a half or two years ago.

The -- I do remember 109, I think, which is the graffiti in the bathroom.

MR. ORGAN: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. COLLIER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I think that was -- time-wise it was outside the scope.

MR. ORGAN: Yes, Your Honor. It was two months after.

THE COURT: So it is -- I would be surprised if there was some basis to let it in this time, and I -- you should not offer it without having previewed it to me outside the presence of the jury in a morning session with a very clear picture of how you could possibly get it in.

And then that might -- if you had to give that clear of a view, then you would probably tip off the Defense on the way to

```
ensure that it never came up.
 1
          So, I would be -- I would be reluctant on 109 and 106.
 2
                                                                   Ι
     don't know what that is, so...
 3
                         106 was the complaint about the N-word in
 4
              MR. ORGAN:
 5
     the elevator area, Your Honor, and Ed Romero forwarded that up
 6
     the chain, I think, to HR and Victor Quintero was also on that,
 7
     so his manager also said that. Both Quintero and Romero
     testified in court that --
 8
                          They never heard the word.
              THE COURT:
 9
              MR. ORGAN:
                                  They never received any complaints
10
                          Right.
11
     about the word and then that's how it came in so.
                         Okay. Well, I will -- I will deal with
12
              THE COURT:
13
     that as it comes up, but you should be cognizant of -- of my
     prior rulings and the reasons for them.
14
15
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
              MR. ORGAN:
16
              MR. SPIRO:
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
              MR. ORGAN:
                         Your Honor, you want us at 8:00 o'clock on
17
18
    Monday; right?
                          No. When the jury is coming in, 8:30 is
19
              THE COURT:
20
     fine. Every other day 8:00 o'clock; but, you know, we will get
21
     together at 8:30. The jury won't come down until
     9:30 probably. It usually -- it takes a while for them to get
22
23
     there so we can deal with any other things that come up.
          There -- I think -- well, Mr. Spiro probably knows from
24
25
    his experience but in general the -- the pool will have shrunk
```

```
from the time that we asked them to come to when they actually
 1
     come down to the courtroom for -- it is just harder to get
 2
     jurors to come to the courthouse these days.
 3
          And so we will -- we will see where we are, but I think we
 4
 5
     are going to have plenty of people to -- from which to pick a
     jury, and I'm looking forward to seeing this trial again.
 6
                                (Laughter)
 7
              MR. ORGAN:
                          We are too, Your Honor. Thank you.
 8
              THE COURT:
 9
                          Okay.
10
              MR. SPIRO:
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
11
              THE COURT:
                         I will see you on Monday morning.
           Have a good weekend.
12
     you.
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
13
              MR. SPIRO:
              MR. ORGAN:
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
14
15
              MR. COLLIER: Have a good weekend.
16
              THE CLERK:
                          That concludes our conference. Thank you
17
     all.
18
                   (Proceedings adjourned at 2:16 p.m.)
                                 ---000---
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. DATE: Friday, March 24, 2023 Marla Krox Marla F. Knox, CSR No. 14421, RPR, CRR, RMR United States District Court - Official Reporter